arXiv:1404.3120v1 [math.CV] 11 Apr 2014

# Landau-Toeplitz theorems for slice regular functions over quaternions

Graziano Gentili*
Dipartimento di Matematica "U. Dini", Università di Firenze
Viale Morgagni 67/A, 50134 Firenze, Italy, gentili@math.unifi.it

Giulia Sarfatti*†
Dipartimento di Matematica "U. Dini", Università di Firenze
Viale Morgagni 67/A, 50134 Firenze, Italy, sarfatti@math.unifi.it

**Abstract**

The theory of slice regular functions of a quaternionic variable, as presented in [10], extends the notion of holomorphic function to the quaternionic setting. This theory, already rich of results, is sometimes surprisingly different from the theory of holomorphic functions of a complex variable. However, several fundamental results in the two environments are similar, even if their proofs for the case of quaternions need new technical tools.

In this paper we prove the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for slice regular functions, in a formulation that involves an appropriate notion of *regular* 2*-diameter*. We then show that the Landau-Toeplitz inequalities hold in the case of the regular $n$-diameter, for all $n \geq 2$. Finally, a 3-diameter version of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem is proved using the notion of *slice* 3*-diameter*.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010):** 30G35, 30C80

**Keywords:** Functions of hypercomplex variables, Geometric theory of regular functions of a quaternionic variable, Schwarz Lemma and generalizations.

## 1 Introduction

The Schwarz Lemma, in its different flavors, is the basis of a chapter of fundamental importance in the geometric theory of holomorphic functions of one and several complex variables. Its classic formulation in one variable is the following:

**Theorem 1.1** (Schwarz Lemma)**.** *Let $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ be the open unit disc of $\mathbb{C}$ centered at the origin, and let $f : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{D}$ be a holomorphic function such that $f(0) = 0$. Then*

$$|f(z)| \leq |z| \tag{1}$$

*for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and*

$$|f'(0)| \leq 1. \tag{2}$$

*Partially supported by GNSAGA of the INdAM and by PRIN "Proprietà geometriche delle varietà reali e complesse" of the MIUR.

†Partially supported by PRIN "Geometria Differenziale e Analisi Globale" of the MIUR.

*Equality holds in* (1) *for some* $z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$*, or in* (2)*, if and only if there exists* $u \in \mathbb{C}$*, with* $|u| = 1$*, such that* $f(z) = uz$ *for all* $z \in \mathbb{D}$*.*

The Schwarz Lemma, and its extension due to Pick, lead in a natural way to the construction of the Poincaré metric, which plays a key role in the study of the hyperbolic geometry of complex domains and manifolds. In 1907, the same year of the first formulation of the Schwarz Lemma, the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem was proven, [14]. This less known, but quite interesting result, concerns the study of the possible "shapes" of the image of the unit disc under a holomorphic function and it is formulated in terms of the diameter of the image set.

**Theorem 1.2** (Landau-Toeplitz)**.** *Let* $f$ *be holomorphic in* $\mathbb{D}$ *and such that the diameter* $\operatorname{diam} f(\mathbb{D})$ *of* $f(\mathbb{D})$ *equals* 2*. Then*

$$\operatorname{diam} f(r\mathbb{D}) \leq 2r \tag{3}$$

*for all* $r \in (0, 1)$*, and*

$$|f'(0)| \leq 1. \tag{4}$$

*Moreover equality holds in* (3) *for some* $r \in (0, 1)$*, or in* (4)*, if and only if* $f$ *is of the form* $f(z) = a + bz$ *with* $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ *and* $|b| = 1$*.*

This result can be interpreted as a generalization of the classical Schwarz Lemma, in which the diameter of the image set takes over the role of the maximum modulus of the function. Indeed, there exist infinite subsets of the plane that have constant diameter and are different from a disc; the Reuleaux Polygons are a well known example of such sets, [9, 13].

The recent definition of slice regularity for quaternionic functions of one quaternionic variable, inspired by Cullen [6] and developed in [11] and in [12] by Gentili and Struppa, identifies a large class of functions, that includes natural quaternionic power series and polynomials. The study of a geometric theory for this class of functions has by now produced several interesting results, sometimes analogous to those valid for holomorphic functions; the Schwarz Lemma is among these results, [12], together with the Bohr Theorem and the Bloch-Landau Theorem, [7],[8],[15].

Fairly new developments in the theory of holomorphic functions of one complex variable include the analogue of the Schwarz Lemma for meromorphic functions, and open new fascinating perspectives for future researche. In this setting the paper [16] by Solynin recalls into the scenery the approach of Landau and Toeplitz, and its modern reinterpretation and generalization due to Burckel, Marshall, Minda, Poggi-Corradini and Ransford, [3].

In our paper we first prove an analogue of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for slice regular functions. To this purpose we need to introduce a new tool to "measure" the image of the open unit ball $\mathbb{B}$ of the space of quaternions $\mathbb{H}$ through a slice regular function: the *regular diameter*.

**Definition 1.3.** *Let* $f$ *be a slice regular function on* $\mathbb{B} = \{q \in \mathbb{H} : |q| < 1\}$ *and let* $f(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n$ *be its power series expansion. For* $r \in (0, 1)$*, we define the* regular diameter *of the image of* $r\mathbb{B}$ *under* $f$ *as*

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\leq r} |f_u(q) - f_v(q)|,$$

*where*

$$f_u(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n u^n a_n, \qquad f_v(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n v^n a_n.$$

*Moreover, we define the* regular diameter *of the image of* $\mathbb{B}$ *under* $f$ *as*

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B})) = \lim_{r\to 1^-} \tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})).$$

The introduction of this new geometric quantity is necessary because of the peculiarities of the quaternionic environment, and in particular since composition of slice regular functions is not slice regular in general. The regular diameter can play the role of the diameter, in fact the former is finite if and only if the latter is finite. The regular diameter hence appears in the statement of the announced result.

**Theorem 1.4** (Landau-Toeplitz for slice regular functions)**.** *Let $f$ be a slice regular function on $\mathbb{B}$ such that $\tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B})) = 2$ and let $\partial_c f(0)$ be its* slice derivative *in $0$. Then*

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) \leq 2r \quad \textit{for all} \quad r \in (0,1) \tag{5}$$

*and*

$$|\partial_c f(0)| \leq 1. \tag{6}$$

*Moreover, equality holds in* (5) *for some $r \in (0,1)$, or in* (6)*, if and only if $f$ is an affine function, i.e. $f(q) = a + qb$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$ and $|b| = 1$.*

As in the complex setting, Theorem 1.4 can be interpreted as a generalization of the Schwarz Lemma.

The new version of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem proposed in [3] concerns holomorphic functions whose image is measured with a notion of diameter more general than the classic one, the $n$-diameter. In the quaternionic setting, the analogue of this geometric quantity is defined as

**Definition 1.5.** *Let $E \subset \mathbb{H}$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$, the* $n$-diameter *of $E$ is defined as*

$$d_n(E) = \sup_{w_1,\dots,w_n \in E} \Big( \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} |w_k - w_j| \Big)^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}.$$

Retracing the approach used in the complex setting, we are able to obtain only the generalization of the first part of the statement of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for the $n$-diameter. As in the case $n = 2$, we need a notion of regular $n$-diameter $\tilde{d}_n(f(\mathbb{B}))$ for the image of $\mathbb{B}$ through a slice regular function $f$. This notion is a generalization of Definition 1.3, modeled on Definition 1.5 and given in terms of the $*$-product between slice regular functions (see Section 2). For all $n \geq 2$, the regular $n$-diameter turns out to be finite when the $n$-diameter is finite. For this reason, even if it may appear awkward, it makes sense to use the regular $n$-diameter in the following statement.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let $f$ be a slice regular function on $\mathbb{B}$ such that $\tilde{d}_n(f(\mathbb{B})) = d_n(\mathbb{B})$. Then*

$$\tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B})) \leq d_n(r\mathbb{B}) \quad \textit{for all} \quad r \in (0,1)$$

*and*

$$|\partial_c f(0)| \leq 1.$$

Since the 3-diameter of a 4-dimensional subset of $\mathbb{H}$ is attained on a (specific) bidimensional section, we are encouraged to introduce an appropriate notion $\hat{d}_3 f(\mathbb{B})$ of *slice 3-diameter* for $f(\mathbb{B})$, inspired by the power series expansion of the regular 3-diameter. This leads to the following complete result.

**Theorem 1.7** (Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for the slice 3-diameter)**.** *Let $f$ be a slice regular function on $\mathbb{B}$ such that $\hat{d}_3(f(\mathbb{B})) = d_3(\mathbb{B})$. Then*

$$\hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B})) \leq d_3(r\mathbb{B}) \quad \textit{for every} \quad r \in (0,1) \tag{7}$$

*and*

$$|\partial_c f(0)| \leq 1. \tag{8}$$

*Moreover equality holds in* (7)*, fore some $r \in (0,1)$, or in* (8)*, if and only if $f$ is an affine function, $f(q) = a + qb$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$, and $|b| = 1$.*

We point out that all the extensions of the Landau-Toeplitz results presented in this paper generalize the Schwarz Lemma to a much larger class of image sets. In fact, for all $n \geq 2$, there exist infinitely many subsets of the space $\mathbb{H}$, which have fixed $n$-diameter, do not coincide with a 4-ball and neither contain, nor are contained, in the 4-ball. The 4-bodies of constant width are examples of such subsets, presented for instance in [9, 13].

## 2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{H}$ be the skew field of quaternions, obtained by endowing $\mathbb{R}^4$ with the multiplication operation defined on the standard basis $\{1, i, j, k\}$ by $i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = -1$ and $ij = k$, and then extended by distributivity to all quaternions $q = x_0 + x_1 i + x_2 j + x_3 k$. For every $q \in \mathbb{H}$, we define the *real* and *imaginary* part of $q$ as $\mathrm{Re}(q) = x_0$ and $\mathrm{Im}(q) = x_1 i + x_2 j + x_3 k$, its *conjugate* as $\bar{q} = \mathrm{Re}(q) - \mathrm{Im}(q)$ and its *modulus* by $|q|^2 = q\bar{q}$. The multiplicative inverse of each $q \neq 0$ is computed as $q^{-1} = \bar{q}/|q|^2$. Let $\mathbb{S}$ be the unit 2-sphere of purely imaginary quaternions, $\mathbb{S} = \{q \in \mathbb{H} \mid q^2 = -1\}$. Then, for any $I \in \mathbb{S}$, we will denote by $L_I$ the complex plane $\mathbb{R} + \mathbb{R}I$, and, if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$, we further set $\Omega_I = \Omega \cap L_I$. Notice that to every $q \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, we can associate a unique element in $\mathbb{S}$ by the map $q \mapsto \mathrm{Im}(q)/|\mathrm{Im}(q)| = I_q$. Therefore, for any $q \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, there exist and are unique, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, with $y > 0$ and $I_q \in \mathbb{S}$, such that $q = x + yI_q$. If $q$ is real, then $I_q$ can be any element of $\mathbb{S}$.

The preliminary results stated in this section will be given for slice regular functions defined on open balls of type $B = B(0, R) = \{q \in \mathbb{H} \,|\, |q| < R\}$. We point out that, in most cases, these results hold, with appropriate changes, for a more general class of domains, introduced in [5]. Let us now recall the definition of slice regularity.

**Definition 2.1.** *A function $f : B = B(0, R) \to \mathbb{H}$ is said to be* slice regular *if, for every $I \in \mathbb{S}$, its restriction $f_I$ to $B_I$, has continuous partial derivatives and satisfies*

$$\overline{\partial}_I f(x + yI) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + I\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\Big) f_I(x + yI) = 0$$

*for every $x + yI \in B_I$.*

In the sequel we may refer to the vanishing of $\overline{\partial}_I f$ saying that the restriction $f_I$ is holomorphic on $B_I$. In what follows, for the sake of shortness, we will omit the prefix slice when referring to slice regular functions. A notion of derivative, called *slice (or Cullen) derivative*, can be given for regular functions by

$$\partial_c f(x + yI) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x + yI),$$

for $x + yI \in B$. This definition is well posed because it is applied only to regular functions and moreover that slice regularity is preserved by slice differentiation. A basic result connects slice regularity and classical holomorphy, [12]:

**Lemma 2.2** (Splitting Lemma)**.** *If $f$ is a regular function on $B = B(0, R)$, then for every $I \in \mathbb{S}$ and for every $J \in \mathbb{S}$, $J$ orthogonal to $I$, there exist two holomorphic functions $F, G : B_I \to L_I$, such that for every $z = x + yI \in B_I$, it results*

$$f_I(z) = F(z) + G(z)J.$$

As proven in [12],

**Theorem 2.3.** *A function $f$ is regular on $B = B(0,R)$ if and only if $f$ has a power series expansion*

$$f(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n \quad \textit{with} \quad a_n = \frac{1}{n!}\frac{\partial^n f}{\partial x^n}(0)$$

*converging absolutely and uniformly on compact sets in $B(0,R)$.*

In the sequel we will also need the Identity Principle for regular functions, stated here in its "weak" version, [12].

**Theorem 2.4** (Identity Principle)**.** *Let $f : B = B(0,R) \to \mathbb{H}$ be a regular function. Denote by $Z_f$ the zero set of $f$, $Z_f = \{q \in B |\, f(q) = 0\}$. If there exists $I \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $B_I \cap Z_f$ has an accumulation point in $B_I$, then $f$ vanishes identically on $B$.*

A basic result, that will be useful in the sequel, is the following (see [5]).

**Theorem 2.5** (Representation Formula)**.** *Let $f$ be a regular function on $B = B(0,R)$ and let $J \in \mathbb{S}$. Then, for all $x + yI \in B$, the following equality holds*

$$f(x+yI) = \frac{1}{2}\big[f(x+yJ) + f(x-yJ)\big] + I\frac{1}{2}\big[J\big[f(x-yJ) - f(x+yJ)\big]\big].$$

The product of two regular functions is not, in general, regular. To guarantee the regularity we need to introduce the following multiplication operation, denoted by the character $*$.

**Definition 2.6.** *Let $f(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n$ and $g(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n b_n$ be regular functions on $B = B(0,R)$. The* $*$-product *of $f$ and $g$ is the regular function $f * g : B \to \mathbb{H}$ defined by*

$$f * g(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k b_{n-k}.$$

Notice that the $*$-product is associative and is not, in general, commutative. The following result clarifies the relation between the $*$-product and the pointwise product of regular functions, [10].

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let $f(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n$ and $g(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n b_n$ be regular functions on $B = B(0,R)$. Then*

$$f * g(q) = \begin{cases} f(q)g(f(q)^{-1}qf(q)) & \textit{if} \quad f(q) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \textit{if} \quad f(q) = 0 \end{cases}$$

Notice that if $q = x + yI$ (and if $f(q) \neq 0$), then $f(q)^{-1}qf(q)$ has the same modulus and same real part as $q$, hence $T_f(q) = f(q)^{-1}qf(q)$ lies in $x + y\mathbb{S}$, the same 2-sphere as $q$. We have that a zero $x_0 + y_0 I$ of the function $g$ is not necessarily a zero of $f * g$, but one element on the same sphere $x_0 + y_0\mathbb{S}$ does.

To conclude this preliminary section we recall a result that is basic for our purposes (see [12]).

**Theorem 2.8** (Maximum Modulus Principle)**.** *Let $f : B \to \mathbb{H}$ be a regular function. If there exists $I \in \mathbb{S}$ such that the restriction $|f_I|$ has a local maximum in $B_I$, then $f$ is constant in $B$. In particular, if $|f|$ has a local maximum in $B$, then $f$ is constant in $B$.*

## 3 The Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for regular functions

In this section we will prove the analogue of the celebrated Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for holomorphic functions, [4, 14], in the new setting of (quaternionic) regular functions. To reach the aim, we will need a few steps.

Denote by $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ the scalar product of $\mathbb{R}^4$, and by $\times$ the vector product of $\mathbb{R}^3$. Recall that for all purely imaginary quaternions $u, v$ the customary equality $uv = -\langle u, v\rangle + u \times v$ holds. If $w = x + yL \in \mathbb{H}$, then for all $I \in \mathbb{S}$, $\langle w, I\rangle = \langle yL, I\rangle = -\operatorname{Re}(yLI) = -\operatorname{Re}(wI)$.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let $I \in \mathbb{S}$. For any $w \in \mathbb{H}$ we define the imaginary component of $w$ along $I$ as* $\operatorname{Im}_I(w) = \langle w, I\rangle = -\operatorname{Re}(wI)$.

We are now ready to prove a first preliminary result.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let $w \in B = B(0, R)$, $0 < |w| = r < R$, and let $g$ be a holomorphic function on $B \cap L_{I_w}$. If*

$$g(w) = w \quad \textit{and} \quad r = \max_{z \in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}_{I_w}} |g(z)|, \tag{9}$$

*then* $\operatorname{Im}_{I_w}(\partial_c g(w)) = 0$.

*Proof.* To simplify the notation, let us set $I = I_w$. Define $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as the function $\varphi(\theta) = |g(we^{I\theta})|^2$. The Splitting Lemma implies that for every $J \in \mathbb{S}$ orthogonal to $I$ there exist $F, G : B_I \to L_I$, holomorphic functions, such that $g(z) = F(z) + G(z)J$ for every $z \in B_I$. A direct computation shows that $\varphi(\theta) = F(we^{I\theta})\overline{F(we^{I\theta})} + G(we^{I\theta})\overline{G(we^{I\theta})}$. Hence

$$\varphi'(\theta) = -2\operatorname{Im}_I\left(we^{I\theta}\left(F'(we^{I\theta})\overline{F(we^{I\theta})} + G'(we^{I\theta})\overline{G(we^{I\theta})}\right)\right),$$

where $F'$ and $G'$ denote, respectively, the complex derivatives of $F$ and $G$ in $B_I$. Since, by hypothesis, $\theta = 0$ is a maximum for $\varphi$, it turns out that

$$0 = \varphi'(0) = -2\operatorname{Im}_I\left(w\left(F'(w)\overline{F(w)} + G'(w)\overline{G(w)}\right)\right). \tag{10}$$

Moreover $w = g(w) = F(w) + G(w)J$, which implies $F(w) = w$ and $G(w) = 0$. Putting this values in equation (10) we have $0 = -2\operatorname{Im}_I(wF'(w)\bar{w}) = -2|w|^2\operatorname{Im}_I(F'(w))$ which yields $\operatorname{Im}_I(F'(w)) = 0$. Finally, recalling the definition of the slice derivative, and Definition 3.1, we get

$$\operatorname{Im}_I(\partial_c g(w)) = \operatorname{Im}_I\left(F'(w) + G'(w)J\right) = \operatorname{Im}_I(F'(w)) = 0.$$

□

**Remark 3.3.** *The previous result can be interpreted as a consequence of the Julia-Wolff-Carathéodory Theorem (see for instance [1, 2]). In fact hypotheses* (9) *yield that $g : r\mathbb{B}_I \to r\mathbb{B}$ and that $w$ is a boundary fixed point for the restriction of $g$ to $r\mathbb{B}_I$. Hence, if we split the function $g$ as $g(z) = F(z) + G(z)J$, for $z \in r\mathbb{B}_I$, we have that $w$ is a Wolff point for $F : r\mathbb{B}_I \to r\mathbb{B}_I$.*

The proof of the classical Landau-Toeplitz Theorem in the setting of holomorphic maps, [3], relies upon the analogue of Proposition 3.2, which is not sufficient for our purposes in the quaternionic environment. In fact we need the following

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let $g : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{H}$ be a regular function such that $\operatorname{Im}_{I_q}(g(q)) = 0$ for every $q \in \mathbb{B}$. Then $g$ is a real constant function.*

*Proof.* Let $g(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n$ on $\mathbb{B}$. For any $I \in \mathbb{S}$ we split the coefficient $a_n$ as $b_n + c_n J$ with $b_n, c_n \in L_I$ and $J \in \mathbb{S}$ orthogonal to $I$. By hypothesis we have

$$0 = \mathrm{Im}_I(g(z)) = \mathrm{Im}_I\left(\sum_{n\geq 0} z^n(b_n + c_n J)\right) = \mathrm{Im}_I\left(\sum_{n\geq 0} z^n b_n\right)$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{B}_I$. As a consequence of the Open Mapping Theorem the holomorphic map $\sum_{n\geq 0} z^n b_n$ is constant, i.e., $b_n = 0$ for all $n > 0$. Therefore the component of each $a_n$ along $L_I$ vanishes for all $n > 0$. Since $I \in \mathbb{S}$ is arbitrary, this implies $a_n = 0$ for all $n > 0$. The hypothesis yields that $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

□

A basic notion used to state the classical Landau-Toeplitz Theorem is the diameter of the images of holomorphic functions. In the new quaternionic setting, due to the fact that a composition of regular functions is not regular in general, the definition of a "regular" diameter for the images of regular functions requires a peculiar approach.

**Definition 3.5.** *Let $f : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{H}$ be a regular function, $f(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n$, and let $u \in \mathbb{H}$. We define the* regular composition *of $f$ with the function $q \mapsto qu$ as*

$$f_u(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} (qu)^{*n} a_n = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n u^n a_n.$$

Notice that, if $|u| = 1$, the radius of convergence of the series expansion for $f_u$ is the same as the one for $f$. Moreover, if $u$ and $q_0$ lie in the same plane $L_I$, then $u$ and $q_0$ commute and hence $f_u(q_0) = f(q_0 u)$. In particular, if $u \in \mathbb{R}$, then $f_u(q) = f(qu)$ for every $q$. We now have all the necessary tools to give the following

**Definition 3.6.** *Let $f : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{H}$ be a regular function. For $r \in (0, 1)$, we define the* regular diameter *of the image of $r\mathbb{B}$ under $f$ as*

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\leq r} |f_u(q) - f_v(q)|.$$

*Moreover we define the* regular diameter *of the image of $\mathbb{B}$ under $f$ as*

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B})) = \lim_{r\to 1^-} \tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})). \tag{11}$$

**Remark 3.7.** *By the Maximum Modulus Principle for regular functions, $\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))$ is an increasing function of $r$, and hence limit* (11) *always exists. So $\tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B}))$ is well defined.*

Let $E$ be a subset of $\mathbb{H}$. We will denote by $\operatorname{diam} E = \sup_{q,w\in E} |q - w|$, the classical diameter of $E$.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let $f$ be a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$. Then the following inequalities hold*

$$\operatorname{diam}(f(\mathbb{B})) \leq \tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B})) \leq 2\operatorname{diam}(f(\mathbb{B})).$$

*Proof.* In order to prove the first inequality, let $r \in (0, 1)$ and consider $q, w \in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}$. We want to bound the quantity $|f(q) - f(w)|$. Suppose without loss of generality that $|w| \geq |q|$ and moreover that $w \neq 0$. We have

$$|f(q) - f(w)| = \left| f\left(q\frac{|w|}{|w|}\right) - f\left(w\frac{|w|}{|w|}\right)\right| = \left| f_{\frac{q}{|w|}}(|w|) - f_{\frac{w}{|w|}}(|w|)\right|. \tag{12}$$

Where the last equality is due to the fact that $|w|$, being real, commutes with both $q/|w|$ and $w/|w|$. Moreover, since $q/|w| \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$ and $w/|w| \in \partial\mathbb{B}$ equation (12) yields

$$|f(q) - f(w)| \leq \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} |f_u(|w|) - f_v(|w|)| \leq \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\leq r} |f_u(q) - f_v(q)| = \tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})).$$

This implies that $\operatorname{diam}(f(r\overline{\mathbb{B}})) \leq \tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))$. Since the previous inequality holds for any $r \in (0,1)$, we obtain that

$$\operatorname{diam}(f(\mathbb{B})) = \lim_{r\to 1^-} \operatorname{diam}(f(r\overline{\mathbb{B}})) \leq \lim_{r\to 1^-} \tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = \tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B})).$$

To show the missing inequality, let $u, v \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$, $r \in (0,1)$, and let $J, K$ be elements of $\mathbb{S}$ such that $u \in L_J$ and $v \in L_K$. Using the Representation Formula 2.5, and taking into account that $u$ and $x + yJ$ commute as well as $v$ and $x + yK$, we get that for all $q = x + yI \in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
|f_u(q) - f_v(q)| &= \frac{1}{2}|(f((x+yJ)u) - (f(x+yK)v)) + (f((x-yJ)u) - f((x-yK)v)) \\
&+ IJ(f((x-yJ)u) - f((x+yJ)u)) - IK(f((x-yK)v) - f((x+yK)v))| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}|f((x+yJ)u) - (f(x+yK)v)| + \frac{1}{2}|f((x-yJ)u) - f((x-yK)v)| \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}|f((x-yJ)u) - f((x+yJ)u)| + \frac{1}{2}|f((x-yK)v) - f((x+yK)v)| \\
&\leq 2\operatorname{diam} f(r\mathbb{B}).
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Since inequality (13) holds for every $u, v \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$ and for every $q \in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}$, we get

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\leq r} |f_u(q) - f_v(q)| \leq 2\operatorname{diam} f(r\mathbb{B}). \tag{14}$$

Moreover, since inequality (14) holds for every $r \in (0,1)$, we obtain $\tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B})) \leq 2\operatorname{diam}(f(\mathbb{B}))$. □

Notice that if $f$ is an affine function, say $f(q) = a + qb$, then $\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = |b|\operatorname{diam}(r\mathbb{B}) = |b|r\operatorname{diam}(\mathbb{B})$ for every $r \in (0,1)$. In particular, if $f$ is constant, then $\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = 0$. Moreover, the regular diameter $\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))$ is invariant under translations; in fact, if $g(q) = f(q) - f(0)$, then $\tilde{d}_2(g(r\mathbb{B})) = \tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))$ for every $r \in (0,1)$.

**Theorem 3.9** (Landau-Toeplitz for regular functions)**.** *Let $f : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{H}$ be a regular function such that $\tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B})) = \operatorname{diam}\mathbb{B} = 2$. Then*

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) \leq 2r \quad \textit{for every} \quad r \in (0,1) \tag{15}$$

*and*

$$|\partial_c f(0)| \leq 1. \tag{16}$$

*Equality holds in* (15) *for some $r \in (0,1)$, or in* (16)*, if and only if $f$ is an affine function, $f(q) = a + qb$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$ and $|b| = 1$.*

*Proof.* To prove the first inequality, take $u, v \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$, and consider the auxiliary function

$$g_{u,v}(q) = \frac{1}{2}q^{-1}(f_u(q) - f_v(q)).$$

This function is regular on $\mathbb{B}$. Indeed, if the power series expansion of $f$ in $\mathbb{B}$ is $\sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n$, then it turns out that

$$g_{u,v}(q) = \frac{1}{2}q^{-1}\Big(\sum_{n\geq 0} q^n u^n a_n - \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n v^n a_n\Big) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n\geq 0} q^n (u^{n+1} - v^{n+1}) a_{n+1}.$$

From this expression of $g_{u,v}$ we can recover its value at $q = 0$

$$g_{u,v}(0) = \frac{1}{2}(u - v)a_1 = \frac{1}{2}(u - v)\partial_c f(0). \tag{17}$$

Since $g_{u,v}$ is a regular function, using the Maximum Modulus Principle, we get that

$$r \mapsto \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\leq r} |g_{u,v}(q)|$$

is increasing on $(0, 1)$. Moreover, the regularity of the function $q \mapsto f_u(q) - f_v(q)$ yields that, for any fixed $r \in (0, 1)$, we can write

$$\max_{|q|\leq r} |g_{u,v}(q)| = \max_{|q|\leq r} \frac{|f_u(q) - f_v(q)|}{2|q|} = \frac{\max_{|q|\leq r} |f_u(q) - f_v(q)|}{2r},$$

which leads to

$$\frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{2r} = \frac{\max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\leq r} |f_u(q) - f_v(q)|}{2r} = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\leq r} |g_{u,v}(q)|. \tag{18}$$

Therefore $\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))/2r$ is an increasing function of $r$ and hence it is always less than or equal to the limit

$$\lim_{r\to 1^-} \frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{2r} = \frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B}))}{2} = 1.$$

This means that

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) \leq 2r \quad \text{for every} \quad r \in (0, 1), \tag{19}$$

proving hence inequality (15) of the statement. To prove the second inequality, Consider the odd part of $f$,

$$f_{odd}(q) = \frac{f(q) - f(-q)}{2}.$$

Notice that $f_{odd}$ satisfies the hypotheses of the Schwarz Lemma for regular functions (see [12]). Indeed $f_{odd}$ is a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$, $f_{odd}(0) = 0$, and

$$|f_{odd}(q)| = \frac{|f(q) - f(-q)|}{2} \leq \frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B}))}{2} = 1$$

for every $q \in \mathbb{B}$. Hence

$$1 \geq |\partial_c f_{odd}(0)| = \frac{|\partial_c f(q) - \partial_c(f(-q))|}{2}\Big|_{q=0} = \frac{|\partial_c f(q) + \partial_c f(-q)|}{2}\Big|_{q=0} = |\partial_c f(0)|. \tag{20}$$

We will now prove the last part of the statement, covering the case of equality. To begin with, notice that if $f(q) = a + qb$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$ and $|b| = 1$, then equality holds in both (15) and (16).

Conversely, suppose that equality holds in (16), namely that $|\partial_c f(0)| = 1$. In this case we have $|\partial_c f_{odd}(0)| = 1$ and therefore, by the Schwarz Lemma (see [12]),

$$f_{odd}(q) = q\partial_c f(0). \tag{21}$$

We want to show that in this case $\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = 2r$ for every $r \in (0,1)$. In fact, from (17) and (18) it follows

$$\frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{2r} \geq \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} |g_{u,v}(0)| = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \frac{1}{2}|(u-v)\partial_c f(0)| = 1 \quad \text{for every} \quad r \in (0,1).$$

Comparing the last inequality with (19) we get

$$\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = 2r \quad \text{for every} \quad r \in (0,1). \tag{22}$$

We now introduce a new auxiliary function. Take $w \in \mathbb{B}$, with $0 < |w| = r < 1$ and set

$$h_w(q) = \frac{1}{2}(f(q) - f(-w))\partial_c f(0)^{-1}.$$

The function $h_w$ is regular on $\mathbb{B}$ and fixes $w$; indeed

$$h_w(w) = \frac{1}{2}(f(w) - f(-w))\partial_c f(0)^{-1} = f_{odd}(w)\partial_c f(0)^{-1} = w$$

where the last equality is due to (21). We need now to restrict our attention to what happens in $L_{I_w}$. By the Maximum Modulus Principle 2.8, we are able to find $z_0 \in L_{I_w}$, $|z_0| = r$, such that for $z \in L_{I_w}$

$$\max_{|z|\leq r} |h_w(z)| = \frac{1}{2}\max_{|z|\leq r} |f(z) - f(-w)| = \frac{1}{2}|f(z_0) - f(-w)|.$$

Let $\hat{u} \in L_{I_w}$ with $|\hat{u}| = 1$ be such that $-w = z_0\hat{u}$. Then, again for $z \in L_{I_w}$, due to the fact that $z_0$ and $\hat{u}$ commute

$$\max_{|z|\leq r} |h_w(z)| = \frac{1}{2}|f(z_0) - f(z_0\hat{u})| = \frac{1}{2}|f(z_0) - f_{\hat{u}}(z_0)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}}\max_{|z|\leq r} |f_u(z) - f_v(z)|.$$

Recalling (22), for $z \in L_{I_w}$ and $q \in \mathbb{H}$ we obtain

$$\max_{|z|\leq r} |h_w(z)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}}\max_{|q|\leq r} |f_u(q) - f_v(q)| = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B})) = r = |h_w(w)|.$$

The function $h_w$ then satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 3.2, and hence

$$0 = \mathrm{Im}_{I_w}\left(\partial_c h_w(q)_{|_{q=w}}\right) = \mathrm{Im}_{I_w}\left(\frac{1}{2}\partial_c f(w)\partial_c f(0)^{-1}\right).$$

Now recall that $w$ is an arbitrary element of $\mathbb{B}\setminus\{0\}$. By continuity, we get that the function $w \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\partial_c f(w)\partial_c f(0)^{-1}$, regular on $\mathbb{B}$, satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 3.4. Consequently $\frac{1}{2}\partial_c f(w)\partial_c f(0)^{-1}$ is a real constant function and hence $\partial_c f(w)$ is constant as well. Therefore $f$ has the required form $f(q) = f(0) + q\partial_c f(0)$.

We will show now how equality in (15) for some $s \in (0,1)$ implies equality in (16). This and the preceding step will conclude the proof. Suppose that there exists $s \in (0,1)$ such that $\tilde{d}_2(f(s\mathbb{B}))/2s = 1$. By inequality (19) and since $\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))/2r$ is increasing in $r$, we have

$$\frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{2r} = 1 \quad \text{for every} \quad r \in [s,1).$$

Let us prove that this equality holds for all $r \in (0,1)$. To do this, let $\hat{u}, \hat{v} \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$, be such that

$$\frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(s\mathbb{B}))}{2s} = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\le s} |g_{u,v}(q)| = \max_{|q|\le s} |g_{\hat{u},\hat{v}}(q)|$$

(where the first equality follows from equation (18)). Let $r > s$. By the choice of $\hat{u}, \hat{v} \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$, we get

$$1 = \frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{2r} = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\le r} |g_{u,v}(q)| \ge \max_{|q|\le r} |g_{\hat{u},\hat{v}}(q)| \ge \max_{|q|\le s} |g_{\hat{u},\hat{v}}(q)| = 1$$

By the Maximum Modulus Principle the function $g_{\hat{u},\hat{v}}$ must be constant in $q \in \mathbb{B}$ and equal to 1 in modulus. Consider now $r \in (0,s)$. Then

$$1 \ge \frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{2r} = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\le r} |g_{u,v}(q)| \ge \max_{|q|\le r} |g_{\hat{u},\hat{v}}(q)| = 1,$$

which implies, $\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))/2r = 1$ for every $r \in (0,1)$. The claim is now that $|\partial_c f(0)| = 1$. By (20), we first of all obtain

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+} \frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{2r} = 1 \ge |\partial_c f(0)|. \tag{23}$$

Recalling that

$$\frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{2r} = \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\le r} |g_{u,v}(q)|,$$

we can get, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the existence of $u_n, v_n \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$ and $q_n$, with $|q_n| = \frac{1}{n}$ (converging up to subsequences), such that

$$1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\tilde{d}_2(f(\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{B}))}{2\frac{1}{n}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} |g_{u_n,v_n}(q_n)| = |g_{\tilde{u},\tilde{v}}(0)| \le \max_{u,v\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} |g_{u,v}(0)| = |\partial_c f(0)|$$

(the last equality is due to (17)). A comparison with (23) concludes the proof. □

# 4 The $n$-diameter case

To formulate a $n$-diameter version of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for regular functions we begin by giving the definition of $n$-diameter of a subset of $\mathbb{H}$.

**Definition 4.1.** *Let $E \subset \mathbb{H}$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \ge 2$, the* $n$-diameter *of $E$ is defined as*

$$d_n(E) = \sup_{w_1,\dots,w_n\in E} \Big( \prod_{1\le j<k\le n} |w_k - w_j| \Big)^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}.$$

As in the complex case (see [3]), we can state

**Proposition 4.2.** *For all $n \geq 2$, we have $d_n(E) \leq d_2(E) = \mathrm{diam}(E)$. Moreover $d_n(E)$ is finite if and only if $d_2(E)$ is finite.*

As we did in Section 3 in the case of the classical diameter $d_2$, we will adopt a specific definition for the $n$-diameter of the image of a subset of $\mathbb{H}$ under a regular function. We will always consider images of open balls of the form $r\mathbb{B}$.

**Definition 4.3.** *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $f$ be a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$. For $r \in (0,1)$, we define, in terms of the $*$-product, the* regular $n$-diameter *of the image of $r\mathbb{B}$ under $f$ as*

$$\tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B})) = \max_{w_1,\dots,w_n \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\leq r} \left| \prod_{1\leq j<k\leq n}^{*} (f_{w_k}(q) - f_{w_j}(q)) \right|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}.$$

*Moreover, we define the* regular $n$-diameter *of the image of $\mathbb{B}$ under $f$ as*

$$\tilde{d}_n(f(\mathbb{B})) = \lim_{r\to 1^-} \tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B})).$$

The same argument used for the regular diameter in Remark 3.7, guarantees that $\tilde{d}_n(f(\mathbb{B}))$ is well defined. Notice that, because of the non-commutativity of quaternions, the order of the factors of a $*$-product has its importance. We can choose any order we like, but it has to be fixed once chosen. In what follows, when we write $1 \leq j < k \leq n$ we always mean to order the couples $(j,k)$ with the lexicographic order. To simplify the notation, we will sometimes write $j < k$ meaning $1 \leq j < k \leq n$. The first step toward understanding the relation between the $n$-diameter and the regular $n$-diameter is the following result.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let $f : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{H}$ be a regular function, and let $n \geq 2$. Then $\tilde{d}_n(f(\mathbb{B})) \leq \tilde{d}_2(f(\mathbb{B}))$.*

*Proof.* We omit the (technical) proof. The idea is to turn the $*$-product into an usual product with an iterated application of Proposition 2.7. □

Notice that Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.4 imply that if $d_n(f(\mathbb{B}))$ is finite then $\tilde{d}_n(f(\mathbb{B}))$ is finite as well (for any regular function $f$ and $n \geq 2$).
Let us make some simple remarks about the definition of regular $n$-diameter. As for the case $n = 2$, the regular $n$-diameter is invariant under translation: in fact if $f$ is a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$ and $g$ is defined as $g(q) = f(q) - f(0)$, then $\tilde{d}_n(g(r\mathbb{B})) = \tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B}))$. Moreover, if $f(q) = qb$ with $b \in \mathbb{H}$, then $\tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B})) = |b| d_n(r\mathbb{B})$; in particular, if $f$ is constant, then $\tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B})) = 0$. Hence if $f$ is of the form $f(q) = a + qb$, for some quaternions $a$ and $b$, then the regular $n$-diameter of $f(r\mathbb{B})$ coincides with its $n$-diameter.

In order to obtain analogues of inequalities (15) and (16), in the $n$-diameter case, we study the ratio between the regular $n$-diameter of the image of $r\mathbb{B}$ under a regular function $f$ and the $n$-diameter of the domain $r\mathbb{B}$ of $f$.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let $f$ be a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$. Then*

$$\varphi_n(r) = \frac{\tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{d_n(r\mathbb{B})} = \frac{\tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{d_n(\mathbb{B})r}$$

*is an increasing function of $r$ on the open interval $(0,1)$, and*

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+} \varphi_n(r) = |\partial_c f(0)|.$$

*Proof.* If $f$ is a constant or an affine function, then $\varphi_n(r)$ is a constant function. So let $f$ be neither constant nor affine. Fix $w_1, ..., w_n \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}$ and consider the auxiliary function

$$g_{w_1,...,w_n}(q) = d_n(\mathbb{B})^{-\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} q^{-\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \prod_{1\le j<k\le n}^{*} (f_{w_k}(q) - f_{w_j}(q)).$$

Since $f_{w_j}(0) = f(0)$ for every $j = 1, \dots, n$, we get that $g_{w_1,...,w_n}$ is regular on $\mathbb{B}$. Moreover, using the Maximum Modulus Principle as in (18), we can write

$$\varphi_n(r)^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} = \max_{w_1,...,w_n\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\le r} |g_{w_1,...,w_n}(q)|,$$

and hence we can conclude that $\varphi_n(r)$ is increasing in $r$.
In turn, to prove the second part of the statement, we proceed as follows.

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+} \varphi_n(r) = \lim_{r\to 0^+} \frac{\tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{d_n(\mathbb{B})r} = \lim_{r\to 0^+} d_n(\mathbb{B})^{-1} r^{-1} \max_{w_1,...,w_n\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\le r} \left| \prod_{j<k}^{*} (f_{w_k}(q) - f_{w_j}(q)) \right|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}.$$

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+} \varphi_n(r) = \lim_{r\to 0^+} d_n(\mathbb{B})^{-1} r^{-1} \max_{w_1,...,w_n\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|\le r} \left| \prod_{j<k} (f_{w_k}(T_{j,k}(q)) - f_{w_j}(T_{j,k}(q))) \right|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}.$$

where, for all $j < k$, $T_{j,k}(q)$ is a suitable quaternion belonging to the same sphere $\mathrm{Re}(q) + |\,\mathrm{Im}(q)|\mathbb{S}$ of $q$. Since for every $j < k$ it results $|T_{k,j}(q)| = |q|$, if $|q| = r$, using the power series expansion of $f$ we can write

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+} \varphi_n(r) = \lim_{r\to 0^+} d_n(\mathbb{B})^{-1} \max_{w_1,...,w_n\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|=r} \prod_{j<k} \left| \sum_{n\ge 1} (T_{k,j}(q))^{n-1} (w_k^n - w_j^n) a_n \right|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}.$$

Since $\varphi_n(r)$ is lowerbounded by $0$ and it is increasing in $r$, then the limit of $\varphi_n(r)$, as $r$ goes to $0$, always exists. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 3.9, we can find a sequence of points $\{q_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$, such that $|q_m| = \frac{1}{m}$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and a sequence of $n$-tuples $\{(w_{1,m}, ..., w_{n,m})\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \overline{\mathbb{B}}^n$, converging to some $(\hat{w}_1, ..., \hat{w}_n) \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}^n$, such that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi_n\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) = d_n(\mathbb{B})^{-1} \prod_{j<k} \left| \sum_{n\ge 1} (T_{k,j}(0))^{n-1} (\hat{w}_k^n - \hat{w}_j^n) a_n \right|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}.$$

Therefore, by Definition 4.1, we obtain

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi_n\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) = d_n(\mathbb{B})^{-1} |a_1| \prod_{j<k} |(\hat{w}_k - \hat{w}_j)|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}} \le |a_1| = |\partial_c f(0)|.$$

To prove the opposite inequality, notice that, for every choice of $\{\tilde{w}_1, ..., \tilde{w}_n\} \subset \overline{\mathbb{B}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{r\to 0^+} \max_{w_1,...,w_n\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}} \max_{|q|=r} \prod_{j<k} \left| \sum_{n\ge 1} (T_{k,j}(q))^{n-1} (w_k^n - w_j^n) a_n \right|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}} \\ &\ge \lim_{r\to 0^+} \max_{|q|=r} \prod_{j<k} \left| \sum_{n\ge 1} (T_{k,j}(q))^{n-1} (\tilde{w}_k^n - \tilde{w}_j^n) a_n \right|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+}\max_{w_1,\dots,w_n\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}}\max_{|q|=r}\prod_{j<k}\Big|\sum_{n\geq 1}(T_{k,j}(q))^{n-1}(w_k^n-w_j^n)a_n\Big|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}$$

$$\geq \max_{\tilde{w}_1,\dots,\tilde{w}_n\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}}\lim_{r\to 0^+}\max_{|q|=r}\prod_{j<k}\Big|\sum_{n\geq 1}(T_{k,j}(q))^{n-1}(\tilde{w}_k^n-\tilde{w}_j^n)a_n\Big|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}.$$

Therefore we conclude

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+}\varphi_n(r)\geq d_n(\mathbb{B})^{-1}\max_{w_1,\dots,w_n\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}}\prod_{j<k}|(w_j-w_k)a_1|^{\frac{2}{n(n-1)}}=|a_1|=|\partial_c f(0)|.$$

□

By means of Lemma 4.5 it is direct to prove the following result.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let $f$ be a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$ such that $\tilde{d}_n(f(\mathbb{B}))=d_n(\mathbb{B})$. Then*

$$\tilde{d}_n(f(r\mathbb{B}))\leq d_n(r\mathbb{B})\quad \textit{for every}\quad r\in(0,1) \tag{24}$$

*and*

$$|\partial_c f(0)|\leq 1. \tag{25}$$

We believe that if equality holds in (24) for some $r\in(0,1)$ or in (25), then $f$ is affine, but we were not able to prove this statement. On the one hand, it is easy to see that if $f$ is affine, $f(q)=a+qb$ with $a,b\in\mathbb{H}$, $|b|=1$, then equality holds both in (24) and in (25); on the other side, we do not yet know, in general, if the converse holds using the notion of regular $n$-diameter (for $n>2$).

# 5 A 3-diameter version of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem

In this section we prove a complete 3-diameter version of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem. The proof relies upon the elementary fact that three points lie always in a same plane. For this reason the 3-diameter of a subset of $\mathbb{H}$ (which has dimension 4) is always attained on a bidimensional section of the set. To compute the 3-diameter of the unit ball of $\mathbb{H}$ we need to recall a preliminary result, about what happens in the complex case (for a proof, see e.g. [3]). Let $\mathbb{D}$ be the open unit disc of $\mathbb{C}$.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Given $n$ points $\{w_1,...,w_n\}\subset\overline{\mathbb{D}}$*

$$\prod_{1\leq j<k\leq n}|w_j-w_k|\leq n^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

*Moreover, equality holds if and only if (after relabeling) $w_j=u\alpha^j$ with $u\in\mathbb{S}^1$ and $\alpha^j$ n-th root of unity, i.e. $\alpha^j=e^{\frac{i2\pi j}{n}}$, for every $j=1,...,n$.*

For the 3-diameter of the unit ball of $\mathbb{H}$ the following lemma holds

**Lemma 5.2.** *For any $I\in\mathbb{S}$ and any $u\in\partial\mathbb{B}$, we have $d_3(\mathbb{B})=\big(|\alpha_2-\alpha_1||\alpha_3-\alpha_1||\alpha_3-\alpha_2|\big)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, with $\alpha_j=ue^{\frac{I2\pi j}{3}}$, for $j=1,2,3$.*

*Proof.* The result can be easily proved showing that the 3-diameter is attained on a maximal disc that, without loss of generality, can be chosen to be some $\mathbb{B}_I$.

□

Notice that, in particular, $d_3(\mathbb{B}) = d_3(\mathbb{D}) = \sqrt{3}$. To prove a 3-diameter version of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for regular functions, we introduce an appropriate notion of "slicewise" 3-diameter, inspired by the power series expansion of the regular 3-diameter.

**Definition 5.3.** *Let $f : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{H}$ be a regular function, and let $\sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n$ be its power series expansion. If $a_N$ is the first non-vanishing coefficient, let us set $\hat{f}$ to be the function obtained by multiplying $f$ (on the right) by $a_N^{-1}|a_N|$,*

$$\hat{f}(q) = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n a_n a_N^{-1}|a_N| = \sum_{n\geq 0} q^n b_n,$$

*regular on $\mathbb{B}$ as well. For any $I \in \mathbb{S}$, let $w_1, w_2, w_3$ be points in the closed disc $\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I$, and consider the function*

$$\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z) = \sum_{n\geq 0} z^n \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(w_2^j - w_1^j\right)\left(w_3^{k-j} - w_1^{k-j}\right)\left(w_3^{n-k} - w_2^{n-k}\right) b_j b_{k-j} b_{n-k}.$$

*holomorphic in all variables $z, w_1, w_2, w_3$ on $\mathbb{B}_I$. We define the* slice 3-diameter *of $f(r\mathbb{B})$ by*

$$\hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B})) = \sup_{I\in\mathbb{S}} \max_{w_1,w_2,w_3\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \max_{z\in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}} |\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)|^{1/3}, \tag{26}$$

*and the* slice 3-diameter *of $f(\mathbb{B})$ as the limit*

$$\hat{d}_3(f(\mathbb{B})) = \lim_{r\to 1^-} \hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B})).$$

Thanks to the Maximum Modulus Principle 2.8, we get that $r \mapsto \hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B}))$ is an increasing function, and hence that the previous definition is well posed. It is not difficult to prove that $\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)$ is continuous as a function of $I$ and of the real and imaginary parts of $z, w_1, w_2, w_3$. Hence the supremum in $I$ appearing in equation (26) is actually a maximum.

**Remark 5.4.** *For any regular function $f : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{H}$, the slice 3-diameter $\hat{d}_3(f(\mathbb{B}))$ is the same as the slice 3-diameter $\hat{d}_3((f - f(0))(\mathbb{B})) = \hat{d}_3(f(\mathbb{B}) - f(0))$. Moreover it is easy to prove that if the slice 3-diameter $\hat{d}_3(f(\mathbb{B}))$ vanishes, then f is constant.*

In analogy with what happens in the regular $n$-diameter case, we state the following result.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let $f$ be a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$, and for $r \in (0, 1)$, let $\hat{\varphi}_3(r)$ be the ratio defined as*

$$\hat{\varphi}_3(r) = \frac{\hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{d_3(r\mathbb{B})} = \frac{\hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{d_3(\mathbb{B})r}.$$

*Then $\hat{\varphi}_3(r)$ is increasing in $r$ and*

$$\lim_{r\to 0^+} \hat{\varphi}_3(r) = |\partial_c f(0)|.$$

*Proof.* To establish the assertion it is possible to prove that

$$\hat{\varphi}_3(r)^3 = d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-3} \max_{I\in\mathbb{S}} \max_{w_1,w_2,w_3\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \max_{z\in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)\right|$$

(see Definition 5.3) and use the technique of the proof of Lemma 4.5 on each slice.

□

The fundamental tool to prove the "equality case" is the following.

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let $f$ be a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$ and, for $r \in (0,1)$, let*

$$\hat{\varphi}_3(r) = \frac{\hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B}))}{d_3(\mathbb{B})r}.$$

*Then $\hat{\varphi}_3(r)$ is strictly increasing in $r$ except if $f$ is a constant or an affine function, i.e. if $f(q) = a + qb$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$.*

*Proof.* Thanks to Remark 5.4 we can suppose $f(0) = 0$. Since $\hat{\varphi}_3(r)$ is increasing for $r \in (0,1)$, if it is not strictly increasing, then there exist $s, t$, $0 < s < t < 1$, such that $\hat{\varphi}_3$ is constant on $[s,t]$. We will show that this yields that $\hat{\varphi}_3$ is constant on $(0,t]$. Let $I \in \mathbb{S}$ and $w_1, w_2, w_3 \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}_I$ be such that

$$\hat{\varphi}_3(s)^3 = d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-3} \max_{z\in s\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)\right|.$$

For $r \in [s,t]$, we have $\hat{\varphi}_3(r) = \hat{\varphi}_3(s)$ and, by the choice of $w_1, w_2, w_3$,

$$\hat{\varphi}_3(r)^3 \geq d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-3} \max_{z\in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)\right| \geq d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-3} \max_{z\in s\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)\right| = \hat{\varphi}_3(s)^3.$$

Hence, by the Maximum Modulus Principle 2.8, we get that the function $z \mapsto z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)$ is constant on $\mathbb{B}_I$. If we consider now $r \in (0,s)$, then, $\hat{\varphi}_3(r) \leq \hat{\varphi}_3(s)$ and

$$\hat{\varphi}_3(r)^3 \geq d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-3} \max_{z\in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)\right| = d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-3} \max_{z\in s\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)\right| = \hat{\varphi}_3(s)^3.$$

Hence $\hat{\varphi}_3(r) = \hat{\varphi}_3(s)$ for all $r \in (0,t]$. Thanks to Lemma 5.5, we obtain then that

$$\hat{\varphi}_3(r) \equiv \lim_{r\to 0^+} \hat{\varphi}_3(r) = |\partial_c f(0)| = |a_1|$$

for $r \in [0,t]$. Recalling Remark 5.4, we get that either $f$ is constant, or $a_1 = \partial_c f(0) \neq 0$. Let us suppose that $f$ is not constant (so that $b_n = a_n a_1^{-1}|a_1|$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$). Recalling the definition of $\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)$, and since the (constant) function $z \mapsto z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)$ is equal to its limit at 0, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}|a_1|^3 = \hat{\varphi}_3^3(r) &= d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-3}\Big|\sum_{n\geq 3} z^{n-3} \sum_{k=0}^{n}\sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(w_2^j - w_1^j\right)\left(w_3^{k-j} - w_1^{k-j}\right)\left(w_3^{n-k} - w_2^{n-k}\right) b_j b_{k-j} b_{n-k}\Big| \\ &= d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-3}\left|(w_2 - w_1)\,(w_3 - w_1)\,(w_3 - w_2)\,b_1^3\right|\end{aligned}$$

for any $z \in \mathbb{B}_I$. Therefore, thanks to Lemma 5.2, without loss of generality we can suppose that $w_1 = 1, w_2, w_3$ are cube roots of unity in $L_I$. Let now $J$ be an imaginary unit, $J \neq I$, and consider $v_1, v_2, v_3$ cube roots of unity in $L_J$. Then, for any $r \in [0,t]$,

$$\begin{aligned}|a_1| = \hat{\varphi}_3(r) &= d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-1} \max_{I\in\mathbb{S}} \max_{w_1,w_2,w_3\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \max_{z\in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)\right|^{1/3} \\ &\geq d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-1} \max_{z\in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}_J} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{v_1,v_2,v_3}(z)\right|^{1/3} \geq d_3(\mathbb{B})^{-1} \left|z^{-3}\hat{g}_{v_1,v_2,v_3}(z)\right|_{z=0}^{1/3} = |a_1|.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $J \in \mathbb{S}$, if $v_1, v_2, v_3$ are cube roots of unity in $L_J$, the function $z \mapsto z^{-3}\hat{g}_{v_1,v_2,v_3}(z) \equiv c_J$ is constant on $\mathbb{B}_J$. Notice that $|c_J|$ does not depend on $J \in \mathbb{S}$. Let now $I$ be an imaginary unit in $\mathbb{S}$, fix $z \in t\mathbb{B}_I$, with $|z| = r$, and let $w_1 = 1, w_2, w_3$ be cube roots of unity in $L_I$. Consider the function defined for $\zeta \in \mathbb{B}_I$ as

$$h_z^I(\zeta) = z^{-3}\hat{g}_{\zeta,w_2,w_3}(z) = \sum_{n\geq 3} z^{n-3} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(w_2^j - \zeta^j\right)\left(w_3^{k-j} - \zeta^{k-j}\right)\left(w_3^{n-k} - w_2^{n-k}\right) b_j b_{k-j} b_{n-k}.$$

By construction $\zeta \mapsto h_z^I(\zeta)$ is holomorphic on a neighborhood of $\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I$, and

$$\left|h_z^I(\zeta)\right| \leq \hat{\varphi}_3(r)^3 d_3(\mathbb{B})^3 = |a_1|^3 d_3(\mathbb{B})^3.$$

Moreover, its value at $\zeta = 1$ is

$$h_z^I(1) = z^{-3} g_{1,w_2,w_3}(z) = (w_2 - 1)(w_3 - 1)(w_3 - w_2)\, b_1^3 = -3\sqrt{3} I |a_1|^3.$$

Then the function

$$\zeta \mapsto h_z^I(\zeta)\left(h_z^I(1)\right)^{-1} = h_z^I(\zeta) I (3\sqrt{3})^{-1} |a_1|^{-3}$$

fixes the point $\zeta = 1$ and maps the closed unit disc $\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I$ to itself, in fact

$$|h_z^I(\zeta) I (3\sqrt{3})^{-1} |a_1|^{-3}| = |h_z^I(\zeta)| (3\sqrt{3})^{-1} |a_1|^{-3} \leq |a_1|^3 d_3(\mathbb{B})^3 (3\sqrt{3})^{-1} |a_1|^{-3} = 1.$$

We can therefore apply Lemma 3.2 and we get

$$\mathrm{Im}_I\Big( \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta}\Big|_{\zeta=1} h_z^I(\zeta) I (3\sqrt{3})^{-1} |a_1|^{-3} \Big) = 0, \quad \text{that is} \quad \mathrm{Re}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} h_z^I(1)\Big) = 0.$$

Doing the same construction for any $J \in \mathbb{S}$, we get that

$$\mathrm{Re}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} h_z^J(1)\Big) = 0 \tag{27}$$

for any fixed $z \in t\mathbb{B}_J$. An easy computation shows

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} h_z^I(1) = -\sum_{n\geq 3} z^{n-3} \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left(j\left(w_3^{k-j} - 1\right) + (k-j)\left(w_2^j - 1\right)\right)\left(w_3^{n-k} - w_2^{n-k}\right) b_j b_{k-j} b_{n-k}.$$

Thanks to the uniform convergence of the series expansion and since equation (27) holds for any $z \in t\mathbb{B}_I$, we get that the real part of each coefficient must vanish. Namely that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 3$,

$$\mathrm{Re}\Big( \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left(j\left(w_3^{k-j} - 1\right) + (k-j)\left(w_2^j - 1\right)\right)\left(w_3^{n-k} - w_2^{n-k}\right) b_j b_{k-j} b_{n-k} \Big) = 0.$$

The previous equality, together with the fact that it holds true for any $I \in \mathbb{S}$, will lead us to conclude that $b_n = a_n\left(a_1^{-1}|a_1|\right)$ is a real number for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In fact, let us proceed by induction. The first step is trivial: $b_0 = 0$ and

$$b_1 = a_1\left(a_1^{-1}|a_1|\right) = |a_1|.$$

Suppose then that $b_1, \dots, b_{s-1}$ are real numbers. The first coefficient of the series expansion of $\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} h_z^I(1)$ that contains $b_s$ is is the one for which $n = s+2$, and has to satisfy the equation

$$\operatorname{Re}\Big(\sum_{k=2}^{s+1}\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\big(j\big(w_3^{k-j}-1\big)+(k-j)\big(w_2^j-1\big)\big)\big(w_3^{s+2-k}-w_2^{s+2-k}\big)b_j b_{k-j} b_{s+2-k}\Big)=0. \tag{28}$$

In this sum we can gather together the terms containing $b_s$ (which correspond to $(k,j)=(s+1,s),(s+1,1),(2,1)$), that is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\left(s\left(w_3-1\right)+\left(w_2^s-1\right)\right)\left(w_3-w_2\right)\right)b_s(b_1)^2+\left(\left(w_3^s-1\right)+s\left(w_2-1\right)\right)\left(w_3-w_2\right)b_s(b_1)^2\\
&+\left(\left(\left(w_3-1\right)+\left(w_2-1\right)\right)\left(w_3^s-w_2^s\right)\right)b_s(b_1)^2\\
&=\big(\sqrt{3}I(3s+2-(w_2^s+w_3^s))-3(w_2^s-w_3^s))\big)|a_1|^2 b_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we can split equation (28) as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Re}\big(\big(\sqrt{3}I(3s+2-(w_2^s+w_3^s))-3(w_2^s-w_3^s)\big)\big)|a_1|^2 b_s\big)\\
&+\operatorname{Re}\Big(\sum_{j=2}^{s-1}\big(j\big(w_3^{s+1-j}-1\big)+(s+1-j)\big(w_2^j-1\big)\big)\big(w_3-w_2\big)b_j b_{s+1-j} b_1\Big)\\
&+\operatorname{Re}\Big(\sum_{k=3}^{s}\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\big(j\big(w_3^{k-j}-1\big)+(k-j)\big(w_2^j-1\big)\big)\big(w_3^{s+2-k}-w_2^{s+2-k}\big)b_j b_{k-j} b_{s+2-k}\Big)=0.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Both the second and the third term in equation (29) do vanish. We will only show this assertion for the second term when $s$ is even. The proofs that the second term with $s$ odd, and that the third term, vanish are totally similar. If $s$ is even, the second term can be rearranged as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Re}\Big(\sum_{j=2}^{s-1}\big(j\big(w_3^{s+1-j}-1\big)+(s+1-j)\big(w_2^j-1\big)\big)\left(w_3-w_2\right)b_j b_{s+1-j} b_1\Big)\\
&=\operatorname{Re}\Big(\sum_{j=2}^{s/2}\big(j\big(w_3^{s+1-j}+w_2^{s+1-j}-2\big)+(s+1-j)\big(w_2^j+w_3^j-2\big)\big)\left(w_3-w_2\right)b_j b_{s+1-j} b_1\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $w_2^n + w_3^n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w_2^n - w_3^n \in I\mathbb{R}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $b_n \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $n = 1, \dots, s-1$, we get that

$$\operatorname{Re}\Big(\sum_{j=2}^{s-1}\big(j\big(w_3^{s+1-j}+w_2^{s+1-j}-2\big)+(s+1-j)\big(w_2^j+w_3^j-2\big)\big)\big(w_3-w_2\big)b_j b_{s+1-j} b_1\Big)=0.$$

Then equation (29) reduces to $\operatorname{Re}\big(\big(\sqrt{3}I(3s+2-(w_2^s+w_3^s))-3(w_2^s-w_3^s)\big)\big)|a_1|^2 b_s\big)=0$. Therefore, for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\alpha_s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\operatorname{Re}(\alpha_s I b_s) = \alpha_s \operatorname{Re}(I b_s) = \operatorname{Im}_I(b_s) = 0$ for all $I \in \mathbb{S}$. Hence we get $b_s \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $s$. Recalling that $b_n$ are the coefficients of the power series of $\hat{f}$, we get that $\hat{f}(\mathbb{B}_I) \subseteq L_I$ for all $I \in \mathbb{S}$, and hence $\hat{f}$ is complex holomorphic on each slice. Observe that for any $r \in (0,t]$ the slice 3-diameter of $f(r\mathbb{B})$ coincides with the usual 3-diameter of $\hat{f}(r\mathbb{B})$. In fact, for any

$I \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z) &= \sum_{n\geq 0} z^n \sum_{k=0}^{n}\sum_{j=0}^{k} \big(w_2^j - w_1^j\big)\big(w_3^{k-j} - w_1^{k-j}\big)\big(w_3^{n-k} - w_2^{n-k}\big) b_j b_{k-j} b_{n-k} \\ &= \Big(\sum_{n\geq 0} \left((zw_2)^n - (zw_1)^n\right) b_n\Big)\Big(\sum_{n\geq 0} \left((zw_3)^n - (zw_1)^n\right) b_n\Big)\Big(\sum_{n\geq 0} \left((zw_3)^n - (zw_2)^n\right) b_n\Big) \\ &= \big(\hat{f}(zw_2) - \hat{f}(zw_1)\big)\big(\hat{f}(zw_3) - \hat{f}(zw_1)\big)\big(\hat{f}(zw_3) - \hat{f}(zw_2)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $I \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B})) &= \max_{w_1,w_2,w_3\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \max_{z\in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|\hat{g}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}(z)\right|^{1/3} \\ &= \max_{w_1,w_2,w_3\in\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \max_{z\in r\overline{\mathbb{B}}_I} \left|\big(\hat{f}(zw_2) - \hat{f}(zw_1)\big)\big(\hat{f}(zw_3) - \hat{f}(zw_1)\big)\big(\hat{f}(zw_3) - \hat{f}(zw_2)\big)\right|^{1/3} \\ &= d_3(\hat{f}(r\mathbb{B}_I)).\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the complex $n$-diameter version of the Landau-Toeplitz Theorem, [3], we obtain that $\hat{f}$ is an affine function, $\hat{f}(q) = b_0 + qb_1 = a_0 a_1^{-1}|a_1| + q|a_1|$ and hence that $f$ is affine as well, $f(q) = a_0 + qa_1$. □

We can finally prove the

**Theorem 5.7** (Landau-Toeplitz Theorem for the slice 3-diameter)**.** *Let $f$ be a regular function on $\mathbb{B}$ such that $\hat{d}_3 f(\mathbb{B}) = d_3(\mathbb{B})$. Then*

$$\hat{d}_3(f(r\mathbb{B})) \leq d_3(r\mathbb{B}) \quad \textit{for every} \quad r \in (0,1) \tag{30}$$

*and*

$$|\partial_c f(0)| \leq 1. \tag{31}$$

*Moreover equality holds in* (30)*, fore some $r \in (0,1)$, or in* (31)*, if and only if $f$ is an affine function, $f(q) = a + qb$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$, and $|b| = 1$.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.5, both inequalities hold true. For the equality case, if $f(q) = a + qb$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$, $|b| = 1$, it is easy to see that equality holds in both statements. Otherwise, if equality holds in (30) or in (31), then $\hat{\varphi}_3(r)$ defined in Lemma 5.5 is not strictly increasing. Theorem 5.6 implies then that $f$ is an affine function. Moreover, since $\hat{d}_3((f(\mathbb{B})) = d_3(\mathbb{B})$, the coefficient of the first degree term of $f$ has unitary modulus. □

Notice that the notion of the slice 3-diameter does not make sense for $n \geq 4$. Moreover the $n$-diameter of $\mathbb{B}$, when $n \geq 4$, is not anymore attained at points that lie on a same plane $L_I$. In fact, the following result holds true.

**Proposition 5.8.** *For all $I \in \mathbb{S}$ the inequality $d_4(\mathbb{B}) > d_4(\mathbb{B}_I)$ holds.*

*Proof.* The proof follows from the direct computation of the 4-diameter of a maximal tetrahedron contained in $\mathbb{B}$.

□

The proof of Theorem 5.6 heavily relies upon the fact that both the 3-diameter of $\mathbb{B}$ and the slice 3-diameter of $f(\mathbb{B})$ are attained at a complete set of cube roots of unity lying on a same plane $L_I$. We have no alternative proof to use when $n \geq 4$.

## References


[1] M. Abate *Iteration theory of holomorphic mappings on Taut manifolds*, Mediterranean Press, Rende, 1989.

[2] R. B. Burckel, *An introduction to classical complex analysis* Birkhäuser, Basel, 1979.

[3] R. B. Burckel, D. E. Marshall, D. Minda, P. Poggi-Corradini, T. J. Ransford, *Area, capacity and diameter versions of Schwarz's lemma*, Conform. Geom. Dyn., **12** (2008), 133-152.

[4] R. B. Burkel, D. E. Marshall, P. Poggi-Corradini *On a theorem of Landau and Toeplitz* arXiv:math/0603579v1 [math.CV], (2006).

[5] F. Colombo, G. Gentili, I. Sabadini, D. Struppa, *Extension results for slice regular functions of a quaternionic variable*, Adv. Math., **222** (2009), 1793-1808.

[6] C. G. Cullen, *An integral theorem for analytic intrinsic functions on quaternions*, Duke Math. J., **32** (1965), 139-148.

[7] C. Della Rocchetta, G. Gentili, G. Sarfatti, *The Bohr theorem for slice regular functions* Math. Nachr. **285** (2012), 2093-2105.

[8] C. Della Rocchetta, G. Gentili, G. Sarfatti, *A Bloch-Landau theorem for slice regular functions*, in Advances in Hypercomplex Analysis, ed. by G. Gentili, I. Sabadini, M. V. Shapiro, F. Sommen, D. C. Struppa, Springer INdAM Series, Springer, Milan, 2013, pp. 55-74.

[9] R. J. Gardner, *Geometric tomography*, (Second edition), Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 58. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[10] G. Gentili, C. Stoppato, D. C. Struppa, *Regular functions of a quaternionic variable*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, 2013.

[11] G. Gentili, D. C. Struppa, *A new approach to Cullen-regular functions of a quaternionic variable*, C. R., Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, **342** (2006), 741-744.

[12] G. Gentili, D. C. Struppa *A new theory of regular function of a quaternionic variable*, Adv. Math., **216** (2007), 279-301.

[13] T. Lachand-Robert, É. Oudet *Bodies of constant width in arbitrary dimension*, Math. Nachr. **280** (2007), 740-750.

[14] E. Landau, O. Toeplitz, *Über die größte Schwankung einer analytischen Funktion in einem Kreise*, Arch. der Math. und Physik, **11** (1907), 302-307.

[15] G. Sarfatti, *Elements of function theory in the unit ball of quaternions*, Ph.D. Thesis, Università di Firenze, http://www.students.math.unifi.it/users/sarfatti/PhDGiulia.pdf, 2013.

[16] A. Yu. Solynin, *A Schwarz lemma for meromorphic functions and estimates for the hyperbolic metric*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **136** (2008), no. 9, 3133-3143.